

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8-9, 19, 25-27, 33-37, 43-45, 51-52, 66-68, 74-76, 82-83, 94, 100-101, 112, 118-120, and 126-131 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 19, 27, 35, 45, 66, 76, 94, 112, 120, 128, and 129 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-13 of the Reply. These claims have been amended to overcome claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. No new matter has been added.

Applicants' representative appreciates Examiner's acknowledgement in the Final Office Action dated September 5, 2007, that claims 1, 8-9, 19, 25-27, 33-37, 43-45, 51-52, 66-68, 74-76, 82-83, 94, 100-101, 112, 118-120, 126-127, and 129-131 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and that claim 128 would be allowable if rewritten to recite an endpoint of a Point-to-Point Protocol link has an Internet Protocol address, not the link itself. Applicants' representative also thanks the Examiner for courtesies extended during the telephonic interview for the subject application conducted on November 20, 2007, in which it was agreed that the claims as amended may overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 45, 51-52, 66-68, 74-76, and 82-83 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 45, 51, 52, 66-68, 74-76, and 82-83 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner has indicated that independent claims 45, 66, and 76 fail to define structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer that permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. Independent claims 45, 66, and 76 have been amended to cure these defects. Withdrawal of this rejection of independent claims 45, 66, and 76 (and associated dependent claims 51-52, 67-68, 74-75, and 82-83) is therefore respectfully requested in light of the amendments made herein.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 8-9, 19, 25-27, 33-37, 43-45, 51-52, 66-68, 74-76, 82-83, 94, 100-101, 112, 118-120, 126-127, and 129-131 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 8-9, 19, 25-27, 33-37, 43-45, 51-52, 66-68, 74-76, 82-83, 94, 100-101, 112, 118-120, 126-127, and 129-131 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Independent claims 1, 19, 27, 35, 45, 66, 76, 94, 112, 120, and 129 have been amended to remove language deemed indefinite.

In particular, the Examiner requested that applicants clarify whether all of the endpoints of a Point-to-Point Protocol link are identified with an Internet Protocol address or whether only one of the endpoints of a Point-to-Point Protocol link is identified with a Internet Protocol address. To this end, applicants' representative has amended independent claims 1, 19, 27, 35, 45, 66, 76, 94, 112, 120, and 129 to recite the termination endpoint of a Point-to-Point Protocol link and/or session is identified with an Internet Protocol address. Further, as discussed in the above telephonic interview and as claimed, an Internet Protocol address is associated with (1) multiple Point-to-Point Protocol instances between a single wireless device and a wireless network (*see* claim 1); (2) multiple grades of Radio Link Protocol service provided to an application of a wireless device (*see* claim 19); at least one grade of Radio Link Protocol service provided to a first application of a wireless device, and at least one grade of Radio Link Protocol service provided to at least a second application of the wireless device (*see* claim 27); and multiple Point-to-Point Protocol sessions exchanged between a wireless network node and wireless device (*see* claim 35).

Withdrawal of this rejection of independent claims 1, 19, 27, 35, 45, 66, 76, 94, 112, 120, and 129 (and associated dependent claims 8-9, 25-26, 33-34, 36-37, 43-44, 51-52, 67-68, 74-75, 82-83, 100-101, 118-119, 126-127, and 130-131) is therefore respectfully requested in light of the amendments made herein.

III. Objection to Claim 128

Claim 128 stands objected to because it recites "Point-to-Point Protocol links sharing an identical Internet Protocol Address," but would be allowable if rewritten to recite that an endpoint of a Point-to-Point Protocol link has an Internet Protocol address, not the link itself. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason:

Claim 128 has been amended to recite each Point-to-Point Protocol link comprises a termination endpoint associated with the same Internet Protocol Address.

Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested in light of the amendment to claim 128 made herein.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063. [QUALP1027US]

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731